Section M: Government Evaluation

M.1 Basis for Award

The Government intends to award a single Firm-Fixed-Price “C” type contract to the responsible Offeror whose proposal represents the best value to the Government, considering the evaluation factors outlined below. This will be a trade-off process in accordance with FAR Part 15. Factor 1 is significantly more important than Factor 2. All evaluation factors other than cost or price, when combined, are significantly more important than cost or price. The Government reserves the right to award without discussions.

The following factors will be used to evaluate proposals:

- Factor 1: Program Management Plan – Oral Presentation
- Factor 2: Past Performance – Oral Presentation
- Factor 3: Total Evaluated Price (TEP)

M.2 SELECTION PROCESS

A single award will be made utilizing subjective trade-off methodology. The award decision will be based on which proposal is most advantageous or best interest to the Government and will be based on an assessment of proposals against the selection criteria of the solicitation.

Offerors are cautioned that award may be made to other than the highest-technically-rated Offeror, or other than lowest-priced Offeror if the Government determines that paying a price premium is warranted.

To be eligible to receive consideration for award, a rating of no less than “Acceptable” must be achieved for Factor 1 (Program Management). An evaluation rating of “Unacceptable” or “Marginal” for the identified Factor will cause the entire proposal to be ineligible for award. Offerors are cautioned that the award may not necessarily be made to the lowest priced Offeror or the highest technically rated Offeror.

M.2.1 General Selection Information

a. Failure of an Offeror to submit the proposal IAW the date and time deadlines or in the manner specified in the solicitation shall result in proposal rejection; the Contracting Officer will notify an Offeror if the proposal is rejected IAW FAR 15.503(a)(1). All clauses and provisions included in this solicitation are applicable and must be considered in the proposal submission.

b. The Government intends to strictly enforce ALL the solicitation/proposal submission requirements outlined in Section L. Failure to comply with the solicitation requirements may result in an Offeror’s proposal being rejected and not being evaluated; the Contracting Officer will notify an Offeror if the proposal is rejected. All proposal information is subject to verification by the Government. Falsification of any proposal submission, documents, or statements may subject the Offeror to civil or criminal prosecution under 18 U.S.C. 1001. Exceptions to the terms, conditions, and/or provisions of this solicitation or assumptions within the proposal will result in a determination that an Offeror is ineligible to be considered for award.

c. Noncompliance with Terms of Solicitation - The Government may determine an Offeror's proposal ineligible for award if the Offeror fails to comply with the instructions set forth in L.2, L.3 and related Subsections; additionally, any inconsistencies, generalizations, ambiguities or mere reiteration of the Government's requirements will be evaluated less favorably and may constitute the proposal being ineligible for award.

d. Offerors are cautioned that while the Government will not evaluate every PWS (Attachment 0001 PWS Dated 18 June 2026) requirement for the purposes of the source selection evaluation, the awardee will be required to comply with the PWS requirements during contract performance. The Government may determine, at its discretion, that an Offeror's proposal is unacceptable if the proposal indicates that it cannot or will not meet any of the PWS requirements. Unacceptable and/or noncompliant proposals may be rejected; the Contracting Officer will notify an Offeror if the proposal is rejected.

e. The Government may use information other than that provided by the Offeror in its evaluation. Such information, referred to as extrinsic information, is obtained from sources outside the proposal. Sources of extrinsic information may include DCAA, DCMA, and Government databases (for example, IAW PGI 215.404-2, the Government may request audit assistance from DCAA, if necessary).

f. Inconsistencies. The price proposal must be consistent with the Offeror's non-price factor proposal. Unexplained inconsistencies between the Offeror's price and non-price factor proposals which raise questions about the terms of any resulting contract may be assessed as proposal risk and could be considered a flaw under the applicable non-price factor. The purpose of the identification of inconsistencies is to ensure that the Offeror and the Government have a meeting of the minds on the Offeror's intended proposal terms. This review does not refer to and is not related to "unrealistically low" prices, and this language should not be read as though the Government intends to evaluate the Total Evaluated Price for realism.

M.2.2 Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools in Proposal Evaluation

M.2.2.1 Use of AI tools in Support of Evaluations: The Government may employ AI as a tool to assist in the analysis and review of offeror proposals. AI tools may be used to support tasks such as summarizing proposal content, identifying compliance with request for task order proposal / solicitation requirements, and highlighting areas of potential strength, weakness, or risk. It will not be used for scoring, generating adjectival ratings, or making source selection decisions.

M.2.2.2 Maintaining Inherently Governmental Functions: Notwithstanding the use of AI tools to support the evaluation process, all final evaluation judgements, including the assignment or assessment of adjectival ratings, best value determinations, and source selection decisions, will be made exclusively by duly appointed Government personnel. The Government retains sole responsibility for all inherently governmental functions and will not delegate decision making authority to any AI tool.

M.2.2.3 Offeror Confidentiality and Data Protection: The AI tools utilized by the Government will be employed in a manner consistent with applicable regulations that govern the protection of proprietary and source selection sensitive information. The AI tool will be an output-only system. Any generated report data is not saved. No proposal data will be transmitted to or processed by external, non-Government systems without appropriate safeguards and authorizations in place.

M.3 Evaluation Method.

M.3.1 Volume 1: Factor 1 - Program Management Plan

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's Oral Presentation to assess the Offeror's understanding of the requirements, the feasibility and soundness of its approach, and the level of risk associated with its ability to successfully perform the PWS requirements. The Government will evaluate the presentation against the criteria outlined below to assign a combined Technical/Risk rating.

M.3.1.1 Factor 1 – Program Management Plan

The evaluation will assess the degree to which the Offeror's presented approach demonstrates a comprehensive and low-risk Program Management Plan. The Government's evaluation will focus on the following:

- Phase-In Plan: The adequacy and realism of the Offeror's plan to achieve full performance capability within the 90-day transition period without service interruption, including the timely execution of the W-TRS ACA.
- Workforce Management, Staffing and Resource Allocation: The credibility of the Offeror's plan to continuously meet the PWS 3.0.4 Mandatory Minimum Staffing Baseline (MMSB). The evaluation will assess the approach to certification, recruitment, retention, and the adequacy of the strategy to allocate resources across the geographically dispersed sites listed in PWS 3.0.4 to ensure uninterrupted performance.
- Program Health Tracking: The effectiveness of the Offeror's proposed metrics, Quality Control Plan (QCP), and management systems to monitor program health, ensure compliance with Section H reporting requirements (e.g., MSR), and align with the Government's QASP.
- Issue Resolution & Policy Compliance: The soundness of the Offeror's procedures for resolving employee issues and the thoroughness of its plan to enforce Army policies, specifically the SHARP program (PWS 3.13.6), and adhere to the immediate reporting requirements for adverse actions (PWS 3.16.2).
- Surge Execution: The feasibility and agility of the Offeror's approach to fulfilling Government-directed surge requests (PWS 3.6.2) in a timely manner while sustaining all baseline PWS requirements.

M.3.1.2 The Government intends to utilize the following streamlined combined technical/risk rating methodology in conjunction with Factor 1 (Program Management)

M.3.1.3 Key Evaluation Definitions. These key evaluation definitions apply for the evaluation of Factor 1.

Key Evaluation Definitions	
Significant Strength	An aspect of an Offerors' proposal that has appreciable merit or appreciably exceeds specified performance or capability requirements in a way that will be appreciably advantageous to the Government during contract performance.

Strength	An aspect of an Offeror's proposal that has merit or exceeds specified performance or capability requirements in a way that will be advantageous to the Government during contract performance.
Weakness	A flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. See RFO FAR 15.001.
Significant Weakness	A flaw in the proposal that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. See RFO FAR 15.001.
Deficiency	Deficiency is any part of an offer that does not conform to a material requirement of a RFP. A material requirement is one that affects price, quantity, quality, or delivery, or that the RFP requires to be met at the time of proposal submission. See RFO FAR 15.001.

M.3.1.4 The following combined adjectival ratings will be used in the evaluation of Factors 1:

Color Rating	Adjectival Rating	Description
Blue	**Outstanding**	Proposal demonstrates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements and contains multiple strengths and/or at least one significant strength, and risk of unsuccessful performance is low.
Purple	**Good**	Proposal indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements and contains at least one strength or significant strength, and risk of unsuccessful performance is low to moderate.
Green	**Acceptable**	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate.
Yellow	**Marginal**	Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and/or risk of unsuccessful performance is high.
Red	**Unacceptable**	Proposal does not meet requirements of the solicitation and, thus, contains one or more deficiencies and is unawardable, and/or risk of performance is unacceptably high.

M.3.2 Volume II: Factor 2 - Past Performance

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's 5-page PowerPoint and 15-minute Past Performance presentation to assess the Level of Confidence in the Offeror's ability to successfully perform the required effort. The evaluation will be based on verifying baseline criteria, followed by an assessment of two primary aspects: Relevance and Quality.

M.3.2.1. Baseline Criteria (Recency, Quantity, and Role)
Before assessing Relevance and Quality, the Government will verify that the Offeror's submission meets the instructed baseline criteria:

- Recency: The Government will verify that all presented experience was performed within the last three (3) years from the date of solicitation release.
- Quantity and Role: The Government will verify that the Offeror presented a minimum of three (3) distinct past performance examples, and that the Offeror served as the Prime Contractor on at least two (2) of the three (3) presented examples.

(Note: Failure to meet these baseline criteria may negatively impact the Offeror's Relevance and Quality assessments and the resulting Performance Confidence rating).

M.3.2.2. Relevance
The Government will evaluate how closely the presented past performance aligns with the MIOSS program's requirements. The Government will assess the degree to which the Offeror's examples demonstrate relevant experience in:

- Providing medical training and instruction services.
- Managing geographically dispersed teams, including CONUS locations.
- Supporting DoD or other government medical communities.
- Successfully managing Firm-Fixed-Price (FFP) contracts with mandatory staffing requirements.

Table 4. Past Performance Relevancy Rating Method

Adjectival Rating	Description
Very Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Somewhat Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved some of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Not Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

M.3.2.3. Quality
The Government will evaluate the Offeror's demonstrated success in executing the relevant contracts. The evaluation will focus on the Offeror's proven capability to deliver services of a similar size, scope, and complexity to the MIOSS Program. Particular emphasis will be placed on the Offeror's ability to consistently meet and maintain mandatory staffing baselines in an FFP environment without degradation of service quality or schedule delays. This quality assessment will be based on the presentation and may be verified via external sources (e.g., CPARS).

Performance Confidence Assessment
Based on the combined assessment of Recency, Relevance, and Quality demonstrated during the presentation (and may be verified via CPARS), the Government will assign one of the following Performance Confidence Assessment ratings:

Confidence Rating	Definition
Substantial Confidence	Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has high expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Satisfactory Confidence	Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Neutral Confidence	No recent/relevant performance record is available, or the Offeror's performance record is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned. The Offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably.
Limited Confidence	Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has low expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
No Confidence	Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has no expectation that the Offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.

M.3.3 Volume III: Fator 3 - PRICE FACTOR

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's Cost/Price proposal for completeness, mathematical accuracy, and price reasonableness in accordance with FAR 15.404-1. A Total Evaluated Price (TEP) will be calculated for each Offeror. The Government will evaluate the Price factor, as follows:

M.3.3.1 The Price evaluation will consider the Total Evaluated Price (TEP) to the Government. The assessment of the TEP will include consideration of the price reasonableness, completeness, the balance of the proposed price, and compliance with the solicitation requirements, including mandatory minimum labor floor rates and escalation requirements. The TEP may differ from the total proposed price as a result of the Government's evaluation of compliance with solicitation requirements. The TEP, rather than the total proposed price, shall be used in the trade-off evaluation to determine best-value.

M.3.3.2 Completeness

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's and applicable subcontractor proposals for completeness. In order for a cost/price proposal to be complete, it must comply with all requirements of the solicitation and any attachments. Incomplete price submissions will not be evaluated and the proposal may be eliminated from competition. The Offeror shall complete the pricing information for all CLINs for the base period and option periods (to include total prices for all periods)..

M.3.3.3 The Total Proposed Price must be identified within the "Totals & USG MPC" tab of Attachment 0003 – GFPM-Prime of the Offeror's proposal. The Total Proposed Price is calculated as follows:

Program Management, PLUS
Base Period Subtotal, PLUS
Option Period 1 Subtotal, PLUS
Option Period 2 Subtotal, PLUS
Option Period 3 Subtotal, PLUS
Option Period 4 subtotal, PLUS
Option to Extend Services FAR 52.217-8

M.3.3.4 Evaluation of Defense Base Act (DBA) Insurance Costs
The Government will evaluate the Offeror's separately detailed DBA insurance breakout to ensure compliance with Section L.3.3.33. The DBA evaluation will be conducted as follows:

- Pure DBA Premium (Part A - Excluded from TEP): The Government will evaluate the proposed pure DBA premium rate for reasonableness and realism. The rate must be substantiated by a current carrier quotation or Forward Pricing Rate Agreement (FPRA). In accordance with the SSP evaluation methodology, the pure DBA premium cost is excluded from the calculation of the TEP.

- Associated Fees, Overhead, and Management Profit (Part B & L.3.3.34.1 - Included in TEP): The Government will evaluate the reasonableness of all applied indirect rates, G&A, and proposed FFP Management Profit. Evaluators will verify that these fees are mathematically accurate, consistent with the Offeror's disclosed accounting practices, and do not contain unallowable profit-on-premium markups. These costs and profits are included in the calculation of the TEP.

- Indirect Rate Unburdening (CAS Compliance): For Offerors whose established accounting practices recover DBA indirectly, the Government will evaluate the proposed indirect rates to ensure they have been appropriately reduced (unburdened) to prevent double-counting.

- Precedence of GFPM-Prime: In the event of a conflict between the Prime's GFPM-Prime spreadsheet and any supplementary narrative data, the GFPM-Prime data shall take precedence and serve as the binding basis for evaluation.

M.3.3.4.1 Deficiencies and Non-Compliance
An Offeror's proposal may be determined non-compliant and ineligible for award if the Offeror fails to:

- Adequately segregate the pure DBA premium from associated fees/profit.
- Provide verifiable supporting carrier quotations or FPRAs.
- Demonstrate the required unburdening of standard indirect rates (if applicable).
- Adequately justify proposed Management Profit in the Price Narrative.

M.3.3.5 Reasonableness. The Government will evaluate the price reasonableness of the Offerors' proposed prices to ensure that in their nature and amount, they do not exceed that which would be incurred by a prudent person in the conduct of competitive business. The

Government will employ the techniques described in FAR 15.404-1(b) to determine that a price is fair and reasonable. Where applicable, the Government may also evaluate the reasonableness of the proposed single elements of cost. The Government may employ cost analysis techniques IAW FAR 15.404-1(c) to determine that a proposed price is fair and reasonable.

M.3.3.6 Price Compliance Assessment. The Government will conduct a mandatory pricing threshold review. The Government will evaluate proposals for compliance with the mandatory minimum labor pricing requirements established in the GFPM-Prime, including minimum base labor floor rates and minimum escalation requirements for option years. Failure to comply with the mandatory pricing requirements or proposals containing proposed direct labor rates below the applicable floor rates shall result in the proposal being deemed ineligible for award.

M.3.3.7 The Government will verify that all direct labor rates proposed by the Prime and its Subcontractors are at or above the Direct Labor Floor Rates as specified in paragraph L.3.3.4 of this RFP. The GFPM-Prime and GFPM-Subs will auto-calculate the proposed direct labor rate as the floor rate in instances where a prime Offeror or subcontractor proposes a direct labor rate below the floor rate. If the GFPM-Prime or GFPM-Subs is modified in any way that results in corruption of the auto-calculation, resulting in any of the proposed direct labor rates by either the Prime or its Subcontractors being below the Government established Direct Labor Floor Rates, the Offeror will be ineligible for award, and will be rejected IAW Section M. Offerors are reminded that they are responsible for ensuring that any and all Subcontractors provide a full and complete labor rate build that provides complete transparency for the direct labor rate component, and each indirect rate applied to it, along with the profit or profit, regardless of contract type.

M.3.3.8 Completeness. Since exchanges are not intended, the Government requires complete proposals with respect to price. A complete proposal will include all information required by the RFP. Attachment 0003 – GFPM-Prime, must include pricing for the base period, each option period, Transition-In, travel, Defense Base Act (DBA) Insurance, and Management Profit on DBA Insurance, and must be consistent with the instructions contained in this RFP.

M.3.3.9 The Offeror must comply with all instructions in Section L. Failure to follow the instructions and provide all of the submission requirements will result in the proposal being rejected IAW M.2, determined ineligible, and no longer considered for award.

M.3.3.10 Unbalanced Pricing. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposal for unbalanced pricing. Unbalanced pricing exists when, despite an acceptable tot al evaluated price, the price of one or more contract line items is significantly overstated or understated as indicated by the application of cost and price analysis techniques. Offerors are cautioned that a proposal the Government assesses to be unbalanced as to price may either be rejected or determined unacceptable for award. See FAR 15.404-1(g) for more information on unbalanced pricing.

M.3.3.11 Evaluation of the Informational Pricing Matrix
The Government will evaluate the Offeror’s Informational Pricing Matrix for completeness, reasonableness, and unbalanced pricing. The Government will verify that the proposed specific Fully Burdened Hourly Rates (FBHR) mathematically align with the Offeror’s total proposed Firm-Fixed-Price (FFP) for the applicable CLINs.

positions (which would serve to improperly minimize Section H Diminished Value Deductions), while shifting costs or profit to other elements of the price proposal, may be deemed to have submitted an unbalanced price. Unbalanced pricing poses an unacceptable risk to the Government and may render the proposal unawardable.

M.3.4 Volume IV: General

M.3.4.1 The Government will be checking for compliance and completeness. All required documentation from section L.3.4 must be submitted, filled out with offerors information required and signed if documentation requires it to be.

The Offeror must comply with all instructions in Section L. Failure to follow the instructions and provide all of the submission requirements will result in the proposal being rejected IAW M.2, determined ineligible, and no longer considered for award.

(End of Section)